



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,094	10/12/2000	Luciano Chavez JR.	AUS9-2000-0431-US1	9522
7590	03/29/2004			
Rudolf O. Siegesmund Suite 2000 4627 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75205-4022			EXAMINER	TRUONG, CAM Y.
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2172	1
DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/687,094	CHAVEZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam Y T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 6 recite the claimed limitations "SBSA and RBSA, BC".

Applicant should spell out these claimed limitations.

Claims 2 and 7 recite "the programmable apparatus of claim 1 and the SBSA of claim 6". The X, Y and Z recite in the claim in a confusing matter. Applicant(s) is/are advised to amend the claim to solve the 112 problem set forth in the claim.

Claim 9, it is not clear as to what the applicant refers to claimed limitation "X, Y, X+1 and Y+1, BC and RBSA". Applicant(s) is/are advised to amend the claim to solve the 112 problem. Applicant(s) is/are reminded that new matter should not be added.

Claim 12 recite the claimed limitation "BC". Applicant should spell out this claimed limitation.

Claim 13, it is not clear as to what the applicant refers to the claimed limitation X, Y, X+1, and Y+1.

Claim 15, it is not clear as to what the applicant refers to Y, BC.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lickiss et al (or hereinafter "Lickiss") (USP 6104798).

As to claim 1, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitation:

"a first computer having a first computer memory" as either a CNS or ReLi customer, first enters the ANIs of their customers into the client GUI 110, either directly or via imported batch file. This information shows that the system has included a client computer memory to allow customers to enter ANIs information (col. 8, lines 60-67);

"a second computer having a second computer memory" as a database server, indicates that the system has included a memory to store database. Server is represented as a first computer (fig. 2, col. 5, lines 50-60);

"the first computer being directed by the SBSA to examine each record in a backup file and determine whether each record is a valid record or an invalid record" as at step 204, the client GUI applies front-end field edits to validate the new ANIS, i.e., ensure that they are in the correct format (col. 8, lines 65-67); a job based oil boxes of documents scanned into the database 24;

"to place the valid record in a batch buffer and invalid records in a failed buffer" as storing all valid ANIs in batch file, which is represented as a batch buffer (col. 8, lines 60-67, col. 9, lines 1-5). Each ANI and incorrect or invalid ANI's is installed in the carrier's On-line Customer Information System 50, which is represented as a failed buffer (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 40-44);

"to determine the number of record in the batch buffer" total ANIs received on the batch of batch file. ANIs are represented as records and batch file is represented as batch buffer (col. 18, lines 1-5) and "transmitting a BC to the second computer" as the client 110 sends the new ANI order batch file to the CD server (col. 9, lines 5-10);

"the second computer being directed by the RBSA, receives the BC and performs an operation on each record in the BC" as the client 110 sends the new ANI order batch file to the CD server. At step 208, the CD server receives the new ANI order batch file, and writes the new orders to the order-tracking database 175, where the CD server validates each new ANI against tables in the calling area database to ensure that the ANI is valid. This information indicates that the CD server is directed by the receiving batch send application to receive batch file. CD server is represented as the second computer (col. 9, lines 5-20; col. 15, lines 50-52).

Lickiss does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a SBSA in the first computer memory; a RBSA in the second computer memory". However, Lickiss teaches that either a CNS or ReLi customer, first enters the ANIs of their customers into the client GUI 110, either directly or via imported batch file, for

later uploaded to the CD server 130. This information indicates that the client computer has included a send batch submission application in memory of client computer to upload batch file to server (col. 8, lines 60-67). After server 130 receives imported batch file, the server validates each new ANI. This information indicates the server computer has included a receive batch submission application in memory to receive imported batch (col. 5, lines 50-60; col. 9, lines 12-15). The client computer memory is represented as first computer memory. The server computer memory is represented as second computer memory.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lickiss's teaching of either a CNS or ReLi customer, first enters the ANIs of their customers into the client GUI 110, either directly or via imported batch file, for later uploaded to the CD server 130 and after server 130 receives imported batch file, the server validates each new ANI in order to allow a user can send a batch of many files to another computer and to allow another computer to receive files from sent computer and to backup files when a system is corrupted.

As to claim 3, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said RBSA directs said second computer to perform an operation on each record, and where an operation on a record failed, to generates an error record" as (col. 15, lines 25-35).

As to claims 5 and 8, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the count of records is equal to the total count of records in the backup file minus the number of invalid records" as (col. 15, lines 15-50).

As to claim 6, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitations:

"a computer readable storage medium" as disk file (col. 3, lines 35-36); "the storage medium so configured by said SBSA, causes the computer to examine each and determine whether each record is valid record or an invalid record" as at step 204, the client GUI applies front-end field edits to validate the new ANIS, i.e., ensure that they are in the correct format before downloading to a server. This information indicates that the client computer has included a storage medium configured by send batch submission application to test each record (col. 8, lines 65-67);

"to place the valid records in a batch buffer and the invalid records in a failed buffer" as storing all valid ANIs in batch file, which is represented as a batch buffer (col. 8, lines 60-67, col. 9, lines 1-5). Each ANI and incorrect or invalid ANI's are installed in the carrier's On-line Customer Information System 50, which is represented as a failed buffer (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 40-44);

"to determine the number of records in the batch buffer and to transmit a BC to the second computer" as total ANIs received on the batch of batch file. ANIs is represented as records and batch file is represented as batch buffer (col.

18, lines 1-5). The client 110 sends the new ANI order batch file to the CD server (col. 9, lines 5-10).

Lickiss does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an SBSA stored in said storage medium". However, Lickiss teaches that the system include disk file (col. 3, lines 35-40). Lickiss also teaches either a CNS or ReLi customer, first enters the ANIs of their customers into the client GUI 110, either directly or via imported batch file, for later uploaded to the CD server 130. This information indicates that the client computer can store a send batch submission application in storage medium or disk to can upload batch file to server (col. 8, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lickiss's teaching of disk file, uploading batch file to the CD server in order to protect a send batch submission application or any data file from damage and contamination and bring file in disk to go any where during traveling.

As to claim 12, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitations:

"validating records prior to submission in the first computer" as at step 204, the client GUI applies front-end field edits to validate the new ANIS, i.e., ensure that they are in the correct format before sending to the server (col. 8, lines 65-67);

"transmitting said BC to said second computer" as a new batch of file contains all valid records for submission to the CD server 130. The system provides that the batch trailer record associated with each batch is automatically

updated to reflect the correct number of records in batch. This information indicates that the system transfers total counted valid record in batch to the server. Since batch file contains a number of valid records counted, thus, batch file can be called as BC (col. 15, lines 40-52; col. 17, lines 40-45);

“receiving said BC in said second computer” as the CD server receives the new ANI order batch file (col. 9, lines 5-10);

“operating on said records in said second computer” as after receiving the new ANI order batch file, the server, write the new orders to the order-tracking database 175 with initial status (col. 5-10).

Lickiss does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “storing said records in a BC”. However, Lickiss teaches that all correct ANI orders are stored in a file to be uploaded to the CD Server 130. The system 100 provides that the Batch trailer record associated with each batch is automatically updated to reflect the correct number of records in the batch. This information shows that the system counts the number of records stored in a file. Since this storing the number of record is counted, thus, this file is represented as BC. All correct ANI orders are represented as records (col. 5, lines 5-7; col. 17, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lickiss’s teaching of storing all correct ANI orders in a file and automatically updating to reflect the correct number of records in the batch in order to allow a user to transfer records to another system for further processing or backup a system.

As to claim 14, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitations

"storing an invalid record in a failed buffer and storing a valid record in a batch buffer" as storing all valid ANIs in batch file, which is represented as a batch buffer (col. 8, lines 60-67, col. 9, lines 1-5). Each ANI and incorrect or invalid ANI's is installed in the carrier's On-line Customer Information System 50, which is represented as a failed buffer (col. 2, lines 20-25; col. 3, lines 40-44);

"calculating a count of records equal to the count of total records read in the validating records prior to submission step minus the number of invalid records" as (col. 15, lines 15-50).

As to claim 16, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitations:

"operating on the record and determining whether the operation failed" as (col. 15, lines 30-45);

"responsive to a determination that the operation failed, generating an error record" as (col. 15, lines 30-45).

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lickiss et al (or hereinafter "Lickiss") (USP 6104798) in view of Martinez et al (or hereinafter "Martinez") (USP 6119229).

As to claim 4, Lickiss discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein said RBSA directs said second

computer to determine whether any records failed to be operated on and, responsive to a determination that there were records that failed to be operated on, to return the records that failed to be operated on to the first computer".

Martinez teaches that if any part of the transaction record is invalid, the entire transaction is rejected and a reason returned (col. 22, lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Martinez's teaching of if any part of the transaction record is invalid, the entire transaction is rejected and a reason returned to Lickiss's system in order to avoid storing invalid record in database.

7. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lickiss in view of Forecast et al (or hereinafter "Forecast") (USP 6230200).

As to claim 13, Lickiss teaches the claimed limitation "responsive to determining that there is a validation error" as (col. 15, lines 30-45).

Lickiss does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "initializing X and Y; setting X to X+1; setting Y = Y+1". Forecast teaches initializing $tui = 0$, $ntu = nTU$, setting $tui = tui + 1$ and setting $ntu = ntu - 1$. Tui is represented as X and ntu is represented as Y (fig. 23, col. 31, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Forecast's teaching of initializing $tui = 0$, $ntu =$

nTU, setting tui=tui +1 and setting ntu=ntu-1 to Lickiss's system in order to count number of retrieved records for transferring to another system.

As to claim 15, Lickiss discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 12, except the claimed limitation "responsive to a determination that the last record has been retrieved, determining whether Y is greater than 0; responsive to a determination that Y is greater than 0, transmitting the BC".

Forecast teaches if $ntu > 0$, loading new transfer unit into the parity buffer (fig. 23, col. 31, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to apply Forecast's teaching of if $ntu > 0$, loading new transfer unit into the parity buffer to Lickiss's system in order to transfer valid records to a user correctly.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Iwamoto et al (USP 5504888).

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is (703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703-305-9790). The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is(703) 872-9360.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

3/14/04



SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER